

562 reason that it breaks the smooth rhythm of its grazing but also
233 because her presence in some way affronts the sheep and might
562 cause disease. *A fortiori* a woman never milks a sheep. Yet there
462 is no rigid avoidance. And, in fact, women regularly do the
233 heavy work in building sheep-folds or moving them to a new
site when they are fouled with mud and dung. And relays of
women at dawn and dusk bring down the newly born lambs
with their mothers from the flock to the clean and better pro-
tected sheep-fold near the huts. They are, however, by preference,
unmarried girls (τσούπρες).

562 But in relation to the division of labour, the complementary
462 opposition of the sexes in fact turns less upon the opposition of
sheep and goats and is more concerned with a wider and more
important distinction. Men are occupied with their extensive
duties of grazing and protecting the flocks, women within or
immediately around the hut, with its central hearth and fire
which gives physical warmth and spiritual protection, are con-
cerned with the intensive tasks of the care of children and the
provision of food, clothes, and shelter for their family. The ex-
pressive role of the woman within the family hut accentuates
the quality of motherhood, not sexuality, and it is consistent
with this aspect of her social personality that the shepherd
brings a sick sheep to his hut to be nursed and cared for by the
women. It is a woman who ties a ewe which has lost its lamb to
the wall of the hut by a short cord so that it cannot sit, and
patiently persuades it to accept the lamb of another ewe which
has borne twins.

462 The assistance women give in the care of the animals is their
direct contribution to the stani. Their work within the hut
concerns only their own family. These tasks are manifold. They
[252] care for the children, cook, bake bread on the open hearth, cut
[322] wood or bushes for the fire, carry water in barrels from the
[312] spring, sometimes from a very considerable distance. In the
[442] stream, or spring, they also wash the clothes of their family.
[222] They search the mountain slopes for wild vegetables and herbs
[241] and in the summer villages they cultivate a small vegetable
[235] garden in which onions, beans, and lettuces are grown. They
[432] also keep a few hens. Some of the eggs are kept for the children
[220] but the majority are bartered in the village shop for dyes and
other small needs. A man may occasionally give his wife a kid

596 he loses strength. Since courage and physical strength are
 826 particularly the qualities that men require in order to defend
 828 the reputation of their families, it becomes clear why, for the
 [577] Sarakatsani, the honour of the family is literally the honour of
 its blood.

596 The solidarity of the family group restricts the expression of
 551 purely individual feelings, opinions, and personality. This is
 [551] reflected in the way that individual members are normally
 described by reference to the father, who until the marriage of
 his eldest son holds the chief authority. After her marriage a
 woman is never again addressed by her baptismal name except
 [553] when she visits the home of her birth. She takes instead the
 christian name of her husband to which the suffix 'ina' is
 [885] added; for instance, Periclina (see p. 70, above). In this way
 there is expressed not only the severance of a woman from her
 family of origin and her subordination to the authority of her
 husband, but also the absolute quality of their union. Similarly
 children of both sexes are known by their own christian name
 followed by the name of their father in the genitive case, for
 instance 'John the son of George'. In the eyes of its own members
 and the outside world, the family is a unity.

581 Whether we regard Sarakatsan marriage as a solemn contract
 between two opposed groups, or as a religious sacrament
 establishing the union of a youth with a maiden, it is certainly a
 transaction which transcends individual interests and desires.
 Just as the partners must be spotless (nobility in the boy,
 virginity in the girl), if the relationships which result from their
 union are to approach and participate in the qualities and
 nature of the divine model, so it is clear that either divorce or
 illegitimacy is incompatible with these values. To be born and
 to grow up in a complete and legitimate family is a minimal
 requirement for the honourable establishment of children.

586 In fact, divorce is permitted in Greece by the Orthodox
 Church on a number of grounds including adultery. Among
 the Sarakatsani I discovered only two instances of divorce;
 but in neither case had the marriage been consummated. In
 one instance, the father of the bridegroom advised his son not
 to have intercourse with the bride because she was coughing
 [239] and expectorating blood. The Sarakatsani are apprehensive
 of tuberculosis, and after eight days during which the girl's

577 honour prestige is not possible. But also for those families, which
554 on other grounds have no prestige, honour itself is already lost.

3. THE HONOURABLE MAN: POSITIVE IDEALS

156 The number of roles which the individual is required or able
554 to assume in this community is limited, and some description of these has already been given in earlier chapters. Whether or not the individual fulfils the more general expectations of his various roles is a further consideration in the assessment of his prestige. Therefore, in this section I shall discuss certain values and qualities which are associated with the different complexes of roles that are appropriate for men and women at various stages of life. These are related to honour and the concepts of manliness and shame but are not always entirely consistent with them.

562 Together with age, the division of the sexes is the significant
[561] discriminating factor in the system of social roles. The two opposed but complementary categories of persons that result from this division provide both a division of labour and a pattern of moral virtues and faults.

462 The division of labour is unambiguous but not rigid. Some tasks which are normally performed by one sex are carried out by persons of the other sex in an emergency. This does not provoke criticism except where the reversal of roles becomes an established feature of a family's working arrangements. A family which day after day sends a twelve-year-old daughter to herd goats will certainly lose prestige. There are, however, a number of tasks which are never attempted by the other sex. For example, women never milk sheep or use a shepherd's crook; men almost never milk goats. Although men will lift heavy objects to secure them to a mule, they never carry burdens on their backs. However sick or feeble his wife or daughter a man will never help her with the intolerable burden of heavy water barrels. These tasks have become diacritical symbols of the two sexes; and to ignore them is to deny that one possesses the essential qualities of one's sex, manliness or shame.

834 As we have seen in earlier chapters, companionship and
562 co-operation between people of opposite sex is possible only within the family and the kindred. Outside these limits the sexes (except in the case of the very old and the very young)

Zagori

THE VALUES OF PRESTIGE

562 well as the men. They admit that they do not possess the intelli-
 828 gence of men. But they take a certain perverse and compensa-
 tory pride in their reputation for cunning and the ability to
 deceive their men 'forty times each day'. They agree that
 women are weak, and that the fault in cases of seduction or adul-
 tery lies mainly with the girl or the wife. Therefore they accept
 it as right that, in the first place, retribution should fall on the
 woman. In customary behaviour this social and moral in-
 feriority is expressed in a number of ways. Women walk behind
 their men when they are together in public and show them
 respect. In church the women huddle at the back or line the
 left-hand wall. Women agree that they are inferior to men in
 every way, and they continually bemoan their fate that they
 were not born into the other sex.

562 Nevertheless, through the possession of shame it is always
 828 open to a woman to discipline and redeem her sexuality. The
 579 inclinations of her nature, whether conscious or not, make this
 [P31] difficult; but it is the prerequisite of honour. Virginity is a
 quality which provokes the deepest respect and a sense almost
 of awe. But the moral dualism of the sexes is finally transcended
 through the paradox that from women are born the noble sons
 [559] who will protect the honour of the race. And, as the mother of
 adult sons whose reputation for manliness is untouched, and
 as a woman now past the period of her active sexuality, she has
 almost overcome the moral disabilities of her sex.

• • •

562 This opposition of the sexes provides the frame for contrasted
 156 ideal types of social personality for men and women at each of
 561 the three stages of adult life.

884 For the unmarried but adult shepherds, the boys (τὰ παῖδιά),
 826 the pallikaria (τὰ παλληκάρια), physical perfection is an im-
 portant ideal attribute. A youth ought to be tall, slim, agile,
 and tough. Ideally, at least, a pallikari is never short in stature.
 A certain regularity and openness of feature is desirable but with-
 out any hint of effeminate fineness. Swarthy complexions and
 [232] narrowly set eyes are deplored. Any kind of physical deformity
 is fatal to the reputation of a young shepherd.

884 But moral qualities are also demanded of the young shepherd,
 579 especially courage and strength of purpose. If in addition to
 554

THE HONOURABLE MAN: POSITIVE IDEALS 279

these qualities he also possesses the necessary physical attributes a young Sarakatsanos can fairly claim to be λεβέντης καὶ παλληκάρι. The first of these terms is perhaps the more composite, describing a youth who is handsome, manly, narrow-hipped, and nimble; such a youth will distinguish himself at a wedding by his upright carriage, restrained manner towards his elders, and his agility in the dance. Παλληκάρι is rather the hero warrior with physical strength and assertive courage who is prepared to die, if necessary, for the honour of his family or his country. Caution must always be foreign to his nature.

It is also said that the young shepherd is free and independent. This does not indicate a freedom from social obligation that permits the indulgence of individual fancy. On the contrary, it means an independence from the cares and duties of a married head of family that frees the young unmarried man to give all his thoughts to the defence and vindication of personal and family honour. A head of family must consider what will happen to his wife and children if through involvement in some affair of honour he is killed or thrown into prison.

Since it is only in the years before he assumes the practical responsibilities of parenthood that a man is both innocent of the sexuality of woman and free to model his actions without compromise according to the ideal pattern of honour, these years of youthful manhood (τὰ νῆα) represent for the Sarakatsani a time of perfected manliness when a man reaches as high a point of moral refinement as the human condition will normally allow. Speaking of his youngest unmarried brother Elias, Demetrios Carvounis explained that he, as leader of his family in a world where the majority of men are without love of honour, was forced from time to time to acts which his conscience did not approve. One day it might be necessary for him to go into court, place his hand on the Holy Bible, and swear falsely to save a member of his family, or his stani, from a crippling fine. Another day he must forgo his natural pride and obsequiously seek the aid of some Government servant. Deceit and lies are always needed in his work. On the other hand Elias was every day with the sheep on the high ridges in the clean mountain air, alone or with a single trusted comrade. Evil could not touch Elias in the same way.

884
156
579
831

He was simple and innocent (ἀπλός καὶ ἀθῶος); not simple in the meaning of an absence of intelligence but in a simple singleness of purpose; and innocent in the sense of freedom from guilt or the need to use guile. Such young men, Demetrios added, since they do not know women, are παστρικοί, that is, clean and pure. Male virginity is the ideal. And continence is thought to confer a certain invulnerability on those who face dangers, especially the danger of bullets in war or brigandage. Of sex relations in marriage Aristoteles, a young man of 28, who in every way conforms in conduct and person to the ideal pallikari pattern, was able to say before other men that he was ashamed even to think of them. Sex, sin, and death are related; [581] similarly virginity, continence, and life. The Sarakatsani anticipate marriage with joy, but also with regret. The founding of a family is wholly good, yet marriage, sex relations, and children, [557] inevitably foreshadow death. The pallikari, not the head of family, is the ideal of manhood.

884
554

It is during these years of early manhood that the community begins seriously to take stock of a man. His marriage will be the means of linking two families in affinal alliance, and the assessment of his manliness is one factor which, in part, determines how other people will treat his family. When he is [302] twenty or twenty-one years old and shortly before he goes on military service, he will grow a moustache, and his father, or brother, will buy him a broad-bladed dagger. These are the outward symbols of his assumption of the status of manhood and of his pretension to be a pallikari.

[302]
[411]

156
884
554
579
578

The community will gradually form an opinion of his prowess as a shepherd, his fearlessness on the high ridges, his devotion to a sick or injured sheep, and his skill in grazing. It is difficult to say how this opinion is formed, since unrelated shepherds seldom work together. Possibly the estimate is sometimes inaccurate. But the critical moment in the development of the young shepherd's reputation is his first quarrel. Quarrels are necessarily public. They may occur in the coffee-shop, the village square, or most frequently on a grazing boundary where a curse or stone aimed at one of his straying sheep by another shepherd is an insult which inevitably requires a violent response. In any case some account of the event becomes public property. If the quarrel occurs before unrelated bystanders, the

THE HONOURABLE MAN: POSITIVE IDEALS 281

community may obtain a reasonably factual account of the fight. If it is not witnessed by an impartial audience, the contestant with the fewer marks of injury and the greater number of persuasive kinsmen wins the day. It is the critical nature of these first important tests of his manliness that makes the self-regard (ἐγωισμός) of the young shepherd so extremely sensitive. It is not only the reality of an obvious insult which provokes him to action, but even the finest of allusions on which it is possible to place some unflattering construction. To direct the slightest public mockery (χορεύματα) against a young shepherd challenges him to fight. It may be possible to recover from an early failure of nerve and conduct, but a series of failures is fatal to a man's reputation. The more clearly his weakness is exposed the more often he risks open ridicule, and only the careful protection of brothers and kinsmen will save him from complete social obloquy. In fact there are few failures. Few physically weak children survive, and from an early age sons learn the meaning of their personal responsibility for the pride and honour of the family.

Sudden death stands close to the Sarakatsani and they are continually aware of its presence. 'He is behind our ear' (τὸν ἔχουμε στὸ ριζάφι),² they say. Many children die in their early years, childbirth is dangerous, shepherds miss their footing on high ridges or fall into swollen rivers. But the tragic quality of the death situation is most evident when the pallikari dies for honour. For the young man will lose the perfection of his manliness if he will not on the instant give up his life in the cause of honour. If men must lead their lives according to a pattern of exemplary actions which express a system of agonistic values, the meaning of existence is the freedom to struggle to realize a certain mode of being and honour which, in the case of the pallikari, the Sarakatsani believe to be as near perfection as the determinations of the human condition will allow. Death extinguishes life, and the ability to compete in terms of pride and significance in social life at the very moment when the pallikari is most fit to compete. Death also removes an individual who was closely bound to family and kin; this is part of the tragedy expressed in the funeral dirge. But if death destroys the individual in the pallikari it leaves untouched his 'persona',

² Cf. Chatzimichalis, op. cit., vol. i, Part A, p. 607.

156
884
554
577
578

156
884
577
761
765

- 156 that part of his personality which, shed of individual traits and
884 circumstances, relates him to the ideal type of manliness that
577 he has realized in dying for his honour. Dishonour can no longer
761 threaten the dead pallikari. He is free. And it is in their certain
knowledge of this that the women of his family will sing in their
dirge not only of their grief, but also of their pride.

156 After marriage the pallikari becomes the head of family.
577 Now the essential ability demanded of him is that he should
885 be an able protector of his family and his flock. Cleverness
(εἰρωνεία) is the quality which he must possess. It implies a
quickness of mind and a degree of foresight. Such a man is not
caught asleep or off his guard. It implies also the skill to plot
with guile and craft. This appreciation of cleverness is evident
in many stories and anecdotes which are told and retold around
the fire after the evening meal. There is the tale of the shepherd
who had scarcely returned to his huts with a stolen lamb when
he saw a detachment of police approaching along the path.
At once he threw the animal into a baby's cradle, covered it
with a blanket, and ordered his wife to undo her blouse and
give it the breast.

156 Lambros, the leader of a substantial co-operating 'company',
885 has a reputation for craftiness. In 1937, in the winter pastures;
577 he shared a grazing boundary with a family of Albanian
425 Muslims who owned a property of 250 acres. Foreseeing that
at some time in the future these Albanians might be expelled
from Greece, Lambros filed a statement with the court of
First Instance to the effect that he had held a lease of protected
rights over this property since 1929. At the time there was no
reason for the clerk to verify Lambros's statement, since any
attempt to implement a false statement would have been
repudiated with ease by the owners; and Lambros would have
faced a serious charge of perjury. Lambros's foresight was
justified in 1944 when the Muslims fled from Thesprotia.
He was now able to produce his document and in a few weeks
he was duly confirmed in his rights of protected lease over a
property which in fact he had never previously occupied. It is
this kind of subtlety that wins for a man the reputation for
cleverness.

577 It is conceded that a head of household must continually use
885 lies. Lies are not the same as purposeful cleverness, although

THE HONOURABLE MAN: POSITIVE IDEALS 283

they are obviously involved in it. But men lie as a matter of habit and principle to deny other people information. And it is one way of expressing their mutual hostility. A head of family who was sincere (ελαφινής), or without cunning words (νρόμπρος), would be considered foolish and neglectful of his duty. 577 885 677

This is not to say that the Sarakatsani fail to understand the virtues of truth and sincerity; indeed, relations between kinsmen, or between man and God, are based upon them. But between unrelated men the narrow limits of the human condition, particularly envy and poverty, prescribe opposite and meaner values. The essentially 'fallen' character of these relationships is implicit in linguistic usage. Κακός, bad or evil, is sometimes used to indicate a skilful man, especially in operations where cleverness or cunning is required. Πονηρός, which means cunning in the sense of the worker-out of evil, is very frequently used to describe a man like Lambros whose cleverness has to be grudgingly admitted and admired by other men. And, on the other hand, καλός, good, in contexts of character description often refers to a man who is merely weak and irresolute. 577 609 828 192

But the truly clever man does not give the impression that he is a threat to other men. Except where the interests of his family are critically at stake, he is careful to appear as honourable and well-intentioned towards unrelated men. There are, however, men who practise a small kind of cunning in all their actions. These persons are described as cunning in a sense that is wholly bad. Μάγας, which means a cunning untrustworthy person, a bearer of mean and untrue scandals, is a word often applied to this kind of man. In the Sarakatsan imagination such a man is small, bent, thin featured, and with narrow close set eyes. The cunning of these men is not the intelligent cleverness of a Lambros, rather it resembles the sexual cunning of women. Both corrupt. The latter corrupts the nobility of men, the former society in general. Cleverness and cunning are legitimate and praiseworthy where their object is the protection or advancement of family interests, but not beyond these limits, or for their own sake. 156 577 828 [192] 826

The heads of families whenever they are free from shepherding ορθ

* Cf. Höeg, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 168.

284

THE VALUES OF PRESTIGE

156 The heads of families whenever they are free from shepherding
 599 duties gather in the village square or the coffee-shop. On this
 571 public stage the chief representatives of the families of part of
 519 the total community appear, and by their attitude and bearing
 885 and the recognition and response they accord to one another
 they confirm or deny the ideal equality of one family with another. This equality is only maintained by a constant effort of self-assertion. A family head must strut about as if his affairs are of the greatest consequence. His expression is expected to be severe and proud. Modesty in these circumstances is no virtue but a sign of weakness. Ideally, the claims and assertions of other men must be at least equalled, and preferably surpassed. Yet care must be taken not to make a boast which can be proved to be empty. The boaster whose bluff has been called
 [52] is despised. Conversation has a sharp, monosyllabic, contrapuntal quality. It is concerned with self-assertion, not with communication or the exchange of information. On these occasions a man must on no account sit quietly in a corner
 [525] unspeaking (ἀμύητος). To withdraw is to admit defeat. Card games often supplement the drinking and the conversation. Although they are games of chance rather than skill, they are acted out with great seriousness. As each man plays his card, this is struck down on to the table with the full force of his open
 [528] hand. Quarrels are frequent if one man wins too handsomely and makes facetious or boasting remarks to the losers.

Yet a man ought to combine with this competitive behaviour a generally sociable attitude. The essence of being one of a company (παρτία) is equal sharing. Each man in his turn is expected to buy a round of drinks for the others. Any hint of meanness is enough to brand a man as tight-fisted (σφιγγρός), a very serious charge. On the other hand, the man who moves to the other extreme, who spends lavishly and indiscriminately on entertaining others, or gambles recklessly at cards, is also condemned. Such people are known as wasteful spenders (σπατάλοι), without any sense of responsibility towards their families.

885 Caution, moderation, and self-restraint are the qualities
 156 demanded of the family head if he is to be a successful steward
 599 of his dependants' interests. We have already seen that in questions of honour the head of the family is unable to hazard himself as freely as his unmarried brother. For similar reasons

THE HONOURABLE MAN: POSITIVE IDEALS 285

the self-regard of the head of family is not so sensitive as that of the unmarried man. The man whose quick anger before marriage was approved as showing the spirit of the pallikari, is condemned as irrationally violent (ζουρλός) if, after his marriage, he draws a knife at the least imagined provocation. The underlying self-restraint of the head of the family, and the fact that the more volatile unmarried shepherds are isolated each with his own flock for the greater part of the year, contribute to a relative degree of peace and order in Sarakatsan communal life. [597]

The family head must be able to cut a figure at a wedding or a village festival. At a feast he ought to be able to drink continuously without becoming either stupefied or aggressive. To fall asleep even after long hours of dancing, feasting, and drinking, is a mark of weakness. A repertoire of songs, and a proud upright bearing in the dance, are necessary for a man's social prestige. Similarly his clothes and appearance on these occasions are important. A man like Costas Pistiolis with his unkempt appearance, clothes fouled with dirt, and his inability to sing or dance, is a figure of mockery at the very few weddings he attends. Graceless (ἀχάριστος), and unnatural (ἀφύσικος), is the verdict passed on this wretched man.

Finally, the degree of dependence on, or independence of, others is a factor which differentiates the prestige of heads of family. To be a tselingas, or a member of the dominant sibling group of a co-operative association of families, carries the greatest prestige. The dependence of a man without brothers on more distant kinsmen is by no means dishonourable, but it is clearly a situation of less prestige. But the family head who is forced to watch the sheep of another unrelated Sarakatsanos, or a villager, for a wage (ρύγα) forfeits any pretension to social reputation. It suggests that he is so poor that he cannot live from his flock without the money supplement of the wage, or that he has no relatives with substantial flocks with whom he might co-operate, or that he is not acceptable to them. Customarily a shepherd's wage is paid only partly in money, the balance being given in kind, grain, and a pair of shoes for every six months of service. The galling feature of becoming a wage shepherd is the fact of dependence on an unrelated man and the sense of being a kept man.

Zagori

888 After a man retires from the active arrangement of affairs,
 156 which he hands over to his eldest son, he is referred to as the
 577 'old man'. He is now expected to become a man who is digni-
 [597] fied but quiet (*ἥσυχος*). He ought to be quiet in the very
 literal sense that he does not attempt to cross the authority of
 his son when the latter makes a decision or issues an order.
 Quarrels between father and son detract from the dignity and
 prestige of both individuals. But the old man ought also to
 acquire an inward quietness of spirit, which follows from his
 release from the worries and cares of leadership and the know-
 ledge that he has reached old age with his reputation for honour
 untouched. For this reason he ought no longer to possess a
 sensitive self-regard. For good, or ill, the record of his life will
 have established his social reputation. Now he ought only to
 be provoked by extreme insults. Such insults will in any case be
 judged as wanton and dishonourable, and will rebound on
 the reputations of those who level them. Normally there is no
 shame in delivering insults, only in receiving them. But a man
 of worth does not revile or pick quarrels with women, children,
 or old men. These categories of persons are inviolable. On the
 other hand, old men are expected to accept with dignity and
 good humour the mild affectionate mockery which is directed
 at them by their juniors.

888 But, although an old man is expected not to interfere in the
 practical arrangement of everyday affairs, he is listened to with
 respect in moments of moral crisis. He has passed beyond both
 the excessive bravadoes of the *pallikari*, and the cautious
 calculation of the family head. It is felt that the old man, now
 near to death, sees the ultimate values in a situation of moral
 conflict with a clearer eye than do his sons and men of their
 generation.

56 For women there are also three stages of adult life. The
 884 first of these is the category of unmarried girls between the age
 582 of sixteen and such time as they are sought in marriage,
 generally when they are about twenty-five or twenty-six
 years old.

156 It follows from what has already been said about the relations
 577 between the sexes, that the critical quality demanded of the
 884 maiden is shame. Just as the freedom from parental responsi-
 831 bilities permits the young man to live according to the values of

Zagori

THE HONOURABLE MAN: POSITIVE IDEALS 287

the pallikari, so the fact that she is not yet a wife and mother allows the maiden to cultivate her shame which lies in her seclusion from the outside world and the denial of her sexuality. This is scarcely possible for a married woman. Not only must she submit to her husband's sexual embraces but her practical duties take her to some extent into the world outside her huts.

The maiden's cultivation of her shame demands that her clothes hide her femininity. Her hair is hidden under a black cotton scarf. A girl who by artifice or accident allows her scarf to become frequently undone gains an evil reputation. The only concession to the display of the hair is that girls grow their hair long, plaited into pigtails. The length of these pig-tails, often artificially increased, is a point of pride and beauty. Thick, black, homespun blouses and woollen cardigans are buttoned to the neck and the wrists. The breasts are not supported and the shapeless bodice of the blouse effectively prevents the least hint of a provocative contour. A black woollen skirt is worn to the ankles. Generally as many as three thick underskirts are also worn under this. The general impression of the whole costume is one of shapelessness. The shame which is felt at the exposure of the body, even when no other person is present, means that undergarments are not changed for long periods and the body between the neck and the ankles is never washed. In contrast the hair is washed at least once a week and the face, hands, and feet once or twice each day.

After she reaches the age of sixteen or seventeen a maiden must discipline her movements. No movement even in domestic labour must be hurried. She ought to walk with a slow and deliberate step. In the dance she must not lift her feet more than an inch or two from the ground. A girl who is seen running risks ridicule and a reputation for shamelessness. If, by evil chance, she were to fall backwards 'with her legs in the air' (ἀνάσκελα) she would virtually lose her honour. A girl should be proud but in a sense different from male pride. Thus she ought to be tall with an upright carriage, but with a gaze which is downcast, not level, and an expressive attitude which is directed inwards, not outwards.

A maiden ought to be secluded, as far as this is possible, from the gaze of the outside world. Not only does this guard her name against slander but, if she is unhealthy or ugly, it may

156
577
884
831
[885]156
884
834
291
[302]

[515]

[302]

884
156
577
834
401

[822]

884
156
577
834

884 help in deceiving possible suitors. But seclusion is also an
 ● 156 element in the cultivation of sexual shame which is essentially
 577 hiding and turning inwards thought and facial expression which
 834 otherwise become a threat to her own honour and that of
 others. It is this knowledge of the powers of her sexuality that
 causes her, out of shame, to lower her eyes and withhold a
 greeting when she meets a man on a narrow path. It is often
 through the eyes that a woman lures a man to disaster. The

[279] attraction need not be consciously exercised. In keeping with
 these ideas unmarried girls over sixteen years of age go only
 twice a year to church to communicate, at Easter and at the
 feast of the Assumption. They are never guests at weddings
 which occur outside the immediate neighbourhood and they
 do not dance in public at village festivals. A girl in this age

[561] grade is never sent to draw water at the well or to collect

[286] firewood when a brother's wife is available. Ideally, she ought
 to spend most of her time preparing her dowry and weaving
 cloth at the wooden loom. Such tasks keep her out of the
 public gaze. If a girl is seen too often abroad it is soon suggested

[574] that she is being shown off to catch a husband. And in Sara-
 katsani thought it is shameful for a girl either personally, or
 through her family, to seek a man in marriage, or in any way
 to attempt to provoke his desire.

156 Necessarily, the married woman and mother is not able to
 577 have as much shame as the maiden. She cannot remain secluded.

834 From time to time she must leave the protective circle of the
 885 huts to fetch water and firewood, milk goats, and rescue her
 vagrant children. But this is not the same thing as saying that

she may ever act in a shameless fashion. Her clothes must be
 as modest as the unmarried girl's and her physical movements,
 if they need not be as subdued, must still be carefully controlled.
 A careful constraint is the quality she must display in her
 public appearances. The Greek word σωφροσύνη, prudence in
 the sense of an inner control of feeling and action, although I
 have never heard it used by Sarakatsani, seems to express
 exactly what is required of the married woman in this respect.

Self-discipline is necessary precisely because she is allowed to
 move about more freely and with less supervision. She must
 appear modest (σεμνή) and serious in disposition (σοβαρή).

It may be remembered how the unrestrained joking of the wife
 of Pistiolis provoked the criticism of other families.

THE HONOURABLE MAN: POSITIVE IDEALS 289

of Pistiolis provoked the criticism of other families. Women must never show emotion in public except where it is conventionally expected, as at a death. A married daughter meeting her father for the first time after a serious abdominal operation from which he had not been expected to recover, merely said in a matter of fact voice 'How are you, father?' A husband does not kiss his wife publicly even in farewell. Sarakatsani women must never shout in public to each other or their husbands as do the village women. In childbirth extreme fortitude is expected. The woman is given a blanket to bite so that she may not scream; and to guard against the possibility of outsiders hearing her groans the other women laugh and talk and, if necessary, beat tin cans. In general, any lack of self-restraint in conventional behaviour suggests that a woman may also be without self-control in respect to her sexual virtue.

There is no need to elaborate again the behaviour expected of a married woman in her roles within the family, qualities such as devotion, humility, and a readiness to co-operate with other women in the group. Physical strength and robustness, rather than fragile beauty, are the physical characters admired in a wife and mother. Without strength the woman is unlikely to survive for long the immense strain of her labours. Health is a question of deep concern for all Sarakatsani but especially for the married woman. To be sick is inexcusable, unless it is an illness that is easily diagnosed and rapidly curable.

As we have seen in an earlier chapter, the woman, especially the mother, expresses the moral solidarity of the family. Women become terrified when they see their men involved in a fight, moaning aloud in their anxiety and continually crossing themselves. But they are also quick to point the path of duty when men hesitate. The scorn of a wife, mother, or sister, is normally more than most men are able to tolerate. When a man has failed to act honourably a portion of the blame falls to the women of the family who are said to lack the courage to shame their men into the right course of action.

But it is in her family that the community chiefly judges the married woman. She must have sons, but one daughter is also desirable. Her own virtues and deficiencies will appear in her children, and upon the manliness of her sons and the shame of

THE HONOURABLE MAN: NEGATIVE RESTRICTIONS 291

The attribution of envy often rests on valid grounds, for such women come, in the main, from families of low prestige and little material prosperity where difficulties in arranging honourable marriages are almost inevitable.

This completes the description of ideal types. Men and women struggle to identify themselves with the ideal type personality that is appropriate to their sex and time of life. And if a man lives in conformity with these normative expectations of social conduct, he is described as *ἄξιος*, honourable. Clearly *ἄξιος*, honourable, is a word with considerably wider reference and less specificity than *τιμή*, honour, since it covers a range of qualities whose applicability is relative to the age and sex of the person described as honourable; while, on the other hand, the values associated with *τιμή* remain always unchanged. If the head of a family fails to avenge the breaking of his daughter's betrothal because there is no adult son, it may be argued that as an 'honourable' man his inaction is due to his concern to protect his family. But if circumstances of age and family commitments excuse to a degree the loss of honour, nevertheless honour is lost. Opposition of the two concepts 'honour' and 'honourable' is not frequent but, when it does occur, the former is always the significant standard where prestige is concerned.

4. THE HONOURABLE MAN:
NEGATIVE RESTRICTIONS

If the man who is *ἄξιος*, honourable, must attempt to achieve a pattern of ideal conduct, there are also certain negative restrictions on action which he must accept. That these restrictions concern, in almost every case, conduct that wantonly threatens the integrity of the family life is not remarkable when we remember on the one hand the spiritual and material significance of the Sarakatsani family group, and on the other the distrust, hostility, and competition which mark the relations between families that are not related through kinship or marriage.

Scandal which falsely questions the virtue of a maiden is believed to be particularly wicked. It may be easily achieved by only a few allusive remarks, whose author probably succeeds in remaining anonymous. For this reason, perhaps, it is strongly believed that God will punish those who spread lying scandals.

683 Sometimes, however, the identity of a scandalmonger becomes
 156 known. John went to another village to catch a glimpse of the
 577 daughter of George Carvounis whom he was considering as a
 584 possible bride for his younger brother Demetrios. In the coffee-
 shop he casually mentioned the girl's name to Michael Goulas
 who, perhaps guessing the direction of the visitor's interest,
 told him that the girl was round-shouldered and absent-
 minded. At first John accepted this statement and without
 further delay returned to his home: but later he was persuaded
 by the marriage negotiator that he had been deceived, and
 after a further visit the marriage contract was eventually
 arranged. Goulas is relatively prosperous but already had a
 reputation for meanness and taciturnity. Even before this
 incident he was an infrequent visitor to the coffee-shop where he
 was careful to avoid any large gathering in whose company he
 might have to spend money. Meanness, envy, and unsociability
 form a pattern of qualities related in Sarakatsani thinking to
 evil and dishonour. The unsociable man is so because he has
 something to hide, he hides what he lacks, and what he lacks
 makes him envious of others. Meanness follows naturally
 upon envy. Had the poison of his scandal been effective, the
 crime of Goulas would probably never have become known.
 In the event, he was condemned and avoided by those who
 accepted John's version of the incident, and people did not
 hesitate to describe him as a man without honour ($\delta\tau\mu\omicron\varsigma$).

It follows that an honourable man, when he covertly glimpses
 a prospective bride, is careful never to disclose, except to trusted
 kinsmen, the true purpose of his visit. For if he decides not to
 ask for the girl's hand, and this fact becomes public knowledge,
 people will wonder what flaw he sees in the girl's character
 and qualities. More generally, it is evil to spread any false
 scandal which may provoke insult, and response to insult,
 between other men, and may lead to killings and orphans.

592 The hut or house is inviolable. No stranger may invade it
 599 without an invitation. Similarly, whatever takes place within
 689 the sanctuary of its walls is private and sacred to the members
 of the family. This understanding makes possible the warmth,
 affection, and easy intercourse of family life secluded from the
 public gaze. It is a sin, and a source of the greatest shame, if a
 man is caught with his ear to the wall of his neighbour's house

294 THE HONOURABLE MAN: NEGATIVE RESTRICTIONS

577
935 he has failed to provide adequately for his children, others must assume a responsibility not to make their humiliating condition worse. If men oppress the very poor of their own community, there is an element of hubris in their conduct that respects neither God nor the family which is His institution.

577
576 In general, where the interests and honour of a family are not affected, every effort ought to be made to avoid giving needless affronts to others. When people pass in hailing distance, conventional greetings must be carefully exchanged. When he is asked for some information which he does not wish to give, or when he is requested to do something which he does not wish to do, a man ought not to reply with a curt negative; rather he should answer in the one case with polite and elaborate evasions, and in the other with a declaration of his willingness to help, balanced by a list of insurmountable difficulties which, nevertheless, he will struggle to overcome. Within the limit of his pride a man ought always to appear sociable and concerned. These prescriptions are not entirely prudential.

[828] There is a consciousness of common humanity. Competitive hostilities prevent men from expressing this feeling except in the marginal areas of social life; but to ignore it entirely is not only socially dangerous, but it denies the essential nobility and generosity of man and provokes the anger of God.

577
626 The community, then, places certain bounds on the expression of hostility. They are not very onerous limitations, but clearly there may often exist doubt, in the evaluation of a man's conduct, as to whether he has overstepped the limit of permissible hostility and, thus, has lost his reputation for acting as an honourable man. Inevitably the duty to further family interests, and the limitation on the expression of hostility, conflict in certain circumstances.

156
577
829 Ideally, it is maintained, a man ought to go beyond the negative prescriptions contained in the notion of the honourable man; he ought also to be positively concerned about the interests and honour of an unrelated man, he ought to be φιλότιμος, caring for, or loving, his honour. That is to say he ought to be so intensely concerned about the nobility of his own conduct that he takes into account how his actions affect the honour and prestige of others. It is still an essentially self-regarding attitude, but the acute concern about the purity of

THE HONOURABLE MAN: NEGATIVE RESTRICTIONS 295

his own motives spills over into an incidental concern for others. Such a man, it is said, will resist the approaches of a woman even where she clearly wishes to be seduced, and where there is no danger of discovery. He never uses lies or deceit to trick another man, or takes advantage of a situation to make another look foolish. A Sarakatsanos when defending his conduct will often say, 'I am a man who loves honour'. But others will not accept this estimate of self. Φιλότητος is an epithet never attributed by one Sarakatsanos to another unrelated shepherd, because they believe that the responsibilities which each individual owes to the family group absolutely preclude his acting in this manner. On the other hand, it is not infrequently used to characterize a patron whose protection is effective; for here interests are complementary, not opposed, and in the particular context of the patron-client relationship it is possible for a man of power to appear to be acting in this way towards his client. And, in a condescending sense, it is possible for a patron to admit the same quality in his client.

* * *

Three concepts, 'honour' (τιμή), 'honourable' (τίμιος), and 'loving honour' (φιλότιμος), have now been considered in their relation to the community's evaluation of a man's conduct and its implicit recognition of his prestige. Although τιμή and φιλότιμος indicate, in different degrees, some concern about other men, all three are essentially self-regarding terms. In each case it is a question of a man attempting to realize a particular ideal pattern of conduct. What interests him is the success of this quest, not the effect of his actions on others.

The quality of being honourable has this in common with honour, that most men are assumed to have it. It is not something which must be competed for, but something which must not be lost. Although there is certainly the need constantly to re-achieve standards of conduct, the emphasis is on the fact that most Sarakatsani have honour, and are honourable, but that individuals, to a greater or less degree, may stray from the path of normative virtue and lose their prestige.

Both the concepts of honour and of the honourable man

● 156 assume, ideally, a community in which all families are equal in
577 their possession of honour, and all men are equal in the honour-
828 able discharge of the duties associated with their social roles.
591 Although a Sarakatsanos seldom explicitly attributes prestige
to another, and struggles always to find some failings in
another's character when he discusses him, yet by the recogni-
tion that he gives another in public life, by the way he shares
conversation and drinking companionship, he may implicitly
admit him to a position of equality. A man may also talk or
drink with a person he considers to be of inferior prestige, but
there are fine nuances of attitude which make this difference
between them very clear. If this evaluation of prestige is
acceptable to the general community the man who is treated as
an inferior will receive no public backing if he chooses to
interpret this treatment as a slight, and reacts to it violently.

156 The flagrant breaking of social norms leads to the withdrawal
577 of recognition and response, that is to a definitive loss of pres-
683 tige. After it became known that Goulas had falsely denigrated
558 the daughter of George Carvounis he appeared even more
infrequently in public, an admission of his shame and humilia-
tion. When he did enter the coffee-shop people greeted him
unenthusiastically, if an exchange of greetings was unavoidable;
but nobody engaged him in conversation, or bought him a
drink. His presence was tolerated, but he was tacitly expelled
from the intimacies of social life. He was no longer an equal
in honour.

156 Conformity is the chief defence against denigration where
577 people believe that the hostile criticism of others protects in
626 some way their own reputation. Moreover the precision of
this criticism is considerable since the social roles which a man
or woman assumes at any period of life are few in number,
and their implications are perfectly understood both by the
protagonists and those who observe them. Yet it would be too
simple a judgement to think that the concepts of honour and
the honourable man depend only on the external sanctions of
competition or mutual hostility. For the Sarakatsani believe
that these ideals and values, which breathe meaning, purpose,
and value into their lives, require no justification or sanction.
They are a way of life, not a code of interdictions.

579 But even social conformity does not necessarily protect

THE VALUES OF PRESTIGE

554 and fearful that he may leave his dependants without a pro-
 577 tector. But although the predicament of a man in this position is
 596 appreciated by other Sarakatsani, it scarcely mitigates the
 loss of prestige. If a man has no adult son to protect his daugh-
 ter's virtue, the fault is his. For weakness is despised. In itself
 it tends to diminish the prestige of a family even before it has
 led to dishonour. And men who are isolated without brothers or
 [156] sons are noticeably less proud, less confident, and in some cases
 are, by Sarakatsan standards, pathetically diffident and ner-
 vous—overt personality traits which I have not observed in
 men born into large sibling groups with a number of brothers.

(B) WEALTH

59 To 346 is the property owned by a family, particularly its
 554 flocks of sheep and goats, the mules and horses. Although money
 556 invested in other objects of prestige such as village houses is
 important, animals in a pastoral community are the significant
 form of wealth and a critical element in social reputation.

Today there are few families that own more than five hundred
 [235] sheep and goats. A household with more than 150 animals
 holds a respectable position in the community, one with 80 to
 120 animals is on the brink of poverty, while a group with less
 than 40 animals is despicably poor. Yet the question of wealth
 is not quite so simple as this arithmetical scale might suggest.
 The Myriounis extended family of five brothers have 476
 animals. Only the flocks of two other families in the Neochori
 local group exceed theirs in size. So long as they remain a
 single family with this large flock and five adult men to serve
 and protect it, the family is clearly, in this respect, a group of
 high prestige among the Neochori shepherds and indeed in the
 total community. But when the family is forced to divide into a
 group of autonomous families, each brother will possess only
 80-90 sheep and goats; it may, therefore, seem that at a single
 stroke they will fall from one end of the wealth-prestige scale
 to the other. In fact, however, so long as the families of a
 group of brothers hold together in a co-operative association,
 folding their sheep together in a single flock (although with
 different ear-signs), they continue to derive some prestige from
 the aggregate number of their animals. Still it will now be said,
 for instance, that Theodoros has only 80 sheep and goats of his

554 again, the dowry of the bride is formally presented ^{For pride,} article to the assembled guests, first at the bride's home, and afterwards at the home of the groom.

558 The display of pride is an important element in prestige but it must itself be based on reality. The pride of a Sarakatsanos may always be disproportionate in the view of other men but when it is wholly false it leads only to mockery.

* * *

183 The elements of prestige have been divided into two categories. The first category emphasizes the ideal equality, in the community, of families and individuals of the same sex and age group. Their ideal equality rests on the belief that most Sarakatsani have honour and are honourable, that they struggle to achieve in their lives ideal patterns of conduct. These elements of prestige require of the individual man or woman constant effort and self-discipline. An idea of the essential nobility of the Sarakatsani underlies them. The second category of elements of prestige are factors which to a considerable degree lie beyond the power of the individual, or even the group, to alter. They are all factors (numbers, wealth, leadership of co-operating groups, opportunities to show hospitality, lineage, marriage alliances, and the effective display of pride) which far from positing the ideal equality of families lead inevitably to their differentiation in terms of prestige. And, necessarily, they are caught up in ideas of fate, envy, and the fallen condition of this world.

The two categories of elements of prestige are nevertheless interdependent and both must figure in the evaluation of a family's total prestige. Without the imputation of honour and the quality of being honourable, wealth and numbers only represent a prestige which is, at best, equivocal. And weakness, or poverty, draws in its train doubts about the honour of a family, however socially conformist it may be.

6. THE SANCTIONS OF PRESTIGE VALUES

156 One sanction for the conduct, qualities, and achievements that have been presented as elements in the prestige of an individual, or a family, is the simple fact of the loss of this

THE SANCTIONS OF PRESTIGE VALUES 307

prestige, a withdrawal of recognition, a kind of social abandonment. But there are also important sanctions related to this withdrawal of social recognition which are internal to the social personality. I refer to the sentiments of self-regard (*ἐγωισμός*)¹⁵⁶ and shame (*ντροπή*).¹⁵⁷

Fundamentally, self-regard is the inner necessity and obligation to achieve identity with the image of the ideal self. This image, of course, is a stereotype presented by society, there is little room for individual speculation, nor would it occur to most Sarakatsani to question its traditional content.

We have seen, in chapter seven, how a father instils in his children a sense of responsibility and loyalty to the family.¹⁵⁶ They learn that in all their actions they are judged by others as representatives of their family and that, therefore, they must compete and hold their own with other children of the same age and sex. A boy learns from songs and stories (and later at school) to identify himself with the values of the idealized heroes of the Revolution. He comes to believe in the superhuman deeds of Katsandonis and Kolokotronis, and in the ability of men to repeat them where the cause has sanctity and men possess honour.

At a more prosaic level he learns, from the interminable criticism of other people's failings, what conduct is expected of himself. The significant point about the image of the ideal self is that it is directed towards what must be positively achieved, that is to the ideal of a social personality with particular moral qualities but also certain material attributes. It is not concerned with a code of moral or ritual interdictions that simply must not be transgressed. Failure to achieve what he expects of himself brings self-disesteem and shame.¹⁵⁶

A man may feel the loss of self-regard even where his dishonourable conduct, or personal inadequacy, is unlikely to become known to others. But more often than not self-regard also has an external point of reference. A man is constantly anxious as to how his actions and qualities will appear

* Although the Sarakatsani use the adjective *φιλότιμος* to describe a person who 'loves honour', they do not use the substantive *τὸ φιλότιμο*, 'a sense' of this honour, which is a concept of popular thought extremely common in many parts of Greece. It is clear, however, that *ἐγωισμός* is a close analogue. [195]

- 156 in the eyes of others, and how their evaluation of himself relates to the ideal image of how he would wish to appear. Clearly, the more the publicity that surrounds any particular area of social life, the greater is the efficacy of the sentiment of self-regard as a sanction of approved qualities and conduct.

156 A man's self-regard is typically molested where he is insulted or defamed or believes himself to be so treated. When 577 another person suggests by even indirect allusion that a man is dishonourable or weak he molests his self-regard (προσβάλλει 578 τὸν ἐγωτισμὸν τοῦ). Or when a man by deed, or word, behaves towards another in such a way as to suggest that he is not worthy of consideration and recognition, he again molests his self-regard; for a man only acts in this way towards another when he considers him to be of lesser reputation and, by inference, less honourable. In such circumstances the core of a man's social personality is touched, his manliness and prepotence are questioned. Then, the only remedy is to attack his detractors with knife or stick.

There are many instances of such a situation. The stoning of a sheep by another shepherd when it has strayed across a boundary. An unguarded public remark which the recipient judges others will consider to be an unanswered insult if he 156 does not retaliate. It is, in part, self-regard which urges the 577 abduction of a girl when a candidate bridegroom has been 578 refused by the girl's father. Christos Kazoukas was refused the hand of the daughter of Paschos. She was too young, the girl's father said, and as she was, indeed, only twenty-two, Christos was prepared to accept this explanation rather than undertake the dangerous business of abduction. But George Carvounis, a second cousin to Christos, heard a different tale that the girl's family had refused Christos because it was said that he was sexually impotent and inadequate. In fact, the girl's mother had dubbed him by a nickname, 'Lame penis' (κουτσουπότσας), which referred literally to these supposed short-comings. Christos had a smooth skin, fine features and a strikingly high-pitched voice. Simply, he did not look the part 624 of a pallikari. There was, therefore, all the greater urgency 612 that he should reply to these damning allegations; for the alternative was ridicule and shame. His kinsmen offered united moral support and the unspoken threat of abandonment if he did nothing.

THE SANCTIONS OF PRESTIGE VALUES 309

he did nothing. In due course, the girl was abducted and agreed to marry Christos out of terror at the threats made by the Kazoukas family against her own people if she did not consent. ¹⁵⁶ ⁵⁷⁷ ⁶³³

Self-regard is a subjective and personal sentiment. At the same time the situations which provoke it are socially defined. All those elements of prestige, whether of the individual or the family, affect it and are sanctioned by it. A man's self-regard leads him to conserve his honour, to act honourably, to strive after wealth, to act proudly and arrogantly and so on. Self-regard inhibits any conduct on which an interpretation of weakness may be placed. For instance, the Sarakatsani seldom accept or give apologies. 'A pardon is not acceptable' (δὲν πιάνεται τὸ παρντόν), it is said. Similarly, bargaining between a shepherd and a livestock merchant is extremely difficult because the self-regard of the seller will not allow him to accept a price which he thinks other men will laugh at, even though he may admit to himself that in relation to the state of the market and the condition of his stock the merchant's offer is not unreasonable. For this reason a merchant employs a Sarakatsanos* who from his local knowledge advises him how far each man may be pressed in negotiation. It is also his task to assure the shepherd that he has made a good bargain. It is self-regard, again, that prevents a Sarakatsanos from reaching a settlement out of court when his animals have trespassed on other people's land. He prefers to go to law knowing in advance that he must pay double the costs of a private agreement. Any compromise would be an admission of weakness in a personal confrontation. Defeat in the courts, on the other hand, is merely defeat by the power of the impersonal State apparatus, which in any case, it is agreed, is corrupt and inimical to the interests of the community. ⁵²⁷ ⁶³⁷ ⁶²⁹ ⁶⁴⁷

Self-regard is a kind of appetitive tension between what a man is and what he ought to be. In this context, however, what a man is depends on the evaluation by the community of what a man is alleged to be, or to have done. The need of a man, socially and psychologically, to identify the community's evaluation of himself with his own ideal image is so great that

* Known as a *καλαούχος*, a guide.

186 it leads, very often, to a greater concern with appearances than reality. Or, rather, appearances become reality. In the appearance of being a pallikari, he becomes a pallikari. There is often a kind of unconscious cheating. A man boasts and asserts himself the more when there is little fear that he may be called on to prove himself. And knives are pulled with greater bravado when it is certain that others are present to prevent their use.

152 If self-regard is the need to achieve an identity with the image
156 of an ideal self, shame is the emotion experienced by an
577 individual when he clearly fails to do so. As in the case of self-regard, although a man may feel shame for short-comings or sufferings that remain secret, it involves at all times some idea of comparison with the achievements of others, and it is all the more acute when a man's inadequacy is publicly exposed. A man may feel shame not only for his own short-comings, but also for those of other persons with whom he is closely identified in any situation. And it may also be a sentiment imputed by others when they make critical comments on a man's behaviour or condition. They may say that his conduct in a particular situation is a matter for shame, that is, if he were an honourable man, his sense of shame would have prevented him from acting in the way that he did.

Like self-regard, shame is a sanction for all those elements that are relevant to the prestige of a family, or an individual. Thus shame relates not only to conduct which is morally bad, but also to any kind of conduct which is only conventionally deviant. And anything which leads to, or is the basis of, low prestige is a matter for shame. Whatever may be the underlying psychological character of shame, its cultural definition amongst the Sarakatsani is the sense or fear of failure. The failure exists to the extent that a man does not possess some attribute required by the image of his ideal self. When a man acts disgracefully he hurts himself. When he is poor or weak, by suffering this condition he condemns himself. And the sense of shame, an essentially internal sanction of action, is related to the external threat of social abandonment, the fear that the community will judge him to be 'lost' (χαμένος).

A number of examples illustrate the relation between shame and failure. When Nasios attempted to seduce a

THE SANCTIONS OF PRESTIGE VALUES 311

married woman he showed that he was not honourable and, further, by hiding in his hut he revealed his cowardice and exposed his manliness to public ridicule. He failed to measure up to the critical qualities required of a man; this was a matter for shame. The young son of Pistiolis, who possesses only sixty sheep, told me that on migrations the family is so ashamed of its poverty that it delays its departure until a few days after the other Sarakatsani have left the village. 'Otherwise people would see how poor we were and would laugh at us.' Eleutherios has a small son who is subject to fits. His brother admitted that this was a matter for shame because people would say that God was punishing the child for its parents' sins. It is a mark of indelible parental failure if children are spotted by any moral or physical blemish. A modest maiden has shame in two respects. She is aware of the power of her sexuality; in a sense she has already failed by being a woman at all, and for this she 'feels shame'. She is also a girl 'with shame' in the sense that she carefully conforms to a strict code of modest behaviour and movement. This expresses the fear of failure in disciplining sexuality according to the ideal pattern of maidenly conduct. Finally, a little child feels shame before a stranger because it lacks experience of a situation it does not understand. It fears failure and criticism. 'The child is ashamed. He does not understand yet,' says the father.

These different contextual situations in which the concept of shame is used are linked by the notion of failure, or fear of failure, whether the emphasis on inadequacy is internal to the social personality, producing feelings of self-disesteem, or whether, as is more often the case, these sentiments are made more acute through public loss of prestige. The laughter, ridicule, and insults actually experienced, or more often imagined, are the marks of failure so far as the external reference of shame is concerned. Between the two sanctions of right conduct, self-regard, and shame, there is a close affinity. While self-regard is the positive incentive to achieve what is expected, shame is the fear, or the realization, of not achieving it. This difference of emphasis is reflected in the fact that to some extent these two sentiments are sex-linked. The idea of self-regard contains the notion of a positive competitive attitude, especially between men of similar age and standing. Women do not go

312

THE VALUES OF PRESTIGE

156 women do not go
 159 out into the world and compete with one another. On the
 562 contrary, their activities centre round the hearth where they
 [602] ought to co-operate with their kinswomen and, if they are married, with their sisters-in-law and the wives of the husband's brothers. When a woman is said to have self-regard, this generally refers to a touchy and unco-operative attitude with other women in the extended family or co-operating group; it is, then, not a quality for self-congratulation.

156 Conversely, where shame is the fear of failure or criticism
 562 that demands a careful modest constrained demeanour, it is
 [831] said that women have more shame than men. The Sarakatsani point out that since it is the sexuality of women which provokes men and not the reverse, women have the greater need to be constantly restrained in their thoughts and actions by a sense of sexual shame. Furthermore, since men must battle with one another in the community and show craftiness in their dealings with prominent and useful people outside its boundaries, it is clear that the restrictive régime, which an extreme sense of shame imposes on an individual, is incompatible with the social role of the head of family who must generally assert himself and on occasion for the sake of his family may even be forced into questionable actions. This is not to say that a man does not equally feel shame when he is judged to have failed. It means, rather, that unlike a woman he cannot remain always in a state of shame, in the sense of guarding against imminent failure by a careful restriction of behaviour and movement.

* * *

156 The fear of gossip and ridicule is closely related to the two
 626 concepts of self-regard and shame. The prestige of an individual, or a family, is constantly being evaluated and re-evaluated in the community through gossip about personalities and events. To be gossiped about is in most cases to be criticized adversely, and since people enjoy this recreation they laugh at and ridicule the object of their discussion. The knowledge, or the imagining, of this ridicule and laughter is an important element in a man's feelings of shame. For if the outside world judges him to be a failure he has also failed to live up to his own ideal image of himself which depends on success.

THE SANCTIONS OF PRESTIGE VALUES 313

The laughter of other people is invited in all situations where a man, or a group, has failed. 'The world laughs' (ὁ κόσμος γελάει) at a man when he fails to defend his honour; for instance, when he does not reply to an affront. Equally, it laughs at him when he makes some slip in conventional behaviour, or when he is made to look ridiculous. It laughs at him if he does not adequately fulfil his social role. Conversely, the need to conform to social morality and etiquette is often supported by the statement that, if a man does not act in a particular way, 'the world will laugh at him'. To be ridiculous (γελοῖος) is to lack the recognition essential for social reputation.

The ridicule or laughter which a man suffers, or imagines he is suffering, is seldom crudely inflicted to his face. The sanction is more subtle. But he is not slow to sense that he is being ridiculed. A man who is insensitive to the attitudes of others (and among the Sarakatsani such men are rare) will speedily be informed of the situation through some kinsman who, because of their association, is anxious that the ridiculed man should reassert his position, if that is possible, or, in a case of moral delinquency, should mend his ways.

There are, however, certain situations where open ridicule may occur. A man of very low prestige who is 'lost' may sometimes be ridiculed to his face. On the rare occasions when Costas Pistiolis is in any social gathering he is invariably asked to sing, since this ability is one of the many social graces he does not possess. Everybody laughs. Mild as such mockery may seem, no honourable member of this community would accept it passively. Open ridicule may also happen at weddings when men lose their sense of caution. At one wedding a guest who was addled and aggressive from his drinking called for more ouzo. A bottle was brought to him. He poured a glass and drank it, only to discover it was water. A roar of laughter went up, a pointed comment on the weakness of a man unable to drink and retain a measure of self-control. At once his knife was out, but it was quickly wrenched from his hand and the man was thrown bodily from the arbour.

Although the community is dispersed, news travels with rapidity. Any interesting event is widely known throughout the community within two or three days. Weddings and festivals are centres of news exchange, but heads of families, and some

571 honour, and one man in the role of married leader whose
 577 prudence and self-control secures its material strength. This
 59 possibility depends on the number of sons in a family and the
 stage of its development. Yet in the critical and unfriendly view
 of others a family must always be in a position to defend
 itself against outrage. Weakness is shameful and circumstances
 never excuse it. The corollary to this notion is that, within
 limits, it is normally preferable to insult than to be insulted,
 to exploit than to be exploited.

577 The emphasis on strength appears in the importance, in
 167 moral judgements, of health, effectiveness (δραστηριότης),
 skill and cleverness. Skill conserves material strength; animals
 are less likely to become diseased, inferior pastures are not
 chosen. A man ought to be 'able' in the sense of able to provide,
 and he needs cleverness of the kind that foresees future threats
 in time. Health is imperative in this scheme of things; chronic
 [1734] sickness or deformity is inexcusable. There is little sentimentality.
 [232]

[1822] chivalrous conduct. An honour killing is accomplished without
 warning by a bullet fired from behind cover, or a knife in the
 back. This does not mean that Sarakatsani are cowards; they
 are, in fact, immensely brave. But, continually, the accent is
 on effective action, the achievement of success, the avoidance of
 failure. Ends matter more than means. Consequently, those
 qualities and attributes that are necessary for strength tend to
 be considered as morally good, those that lead to weakness as
 morally 'bad'. Sarakatsani would condemn any display of
 excessive altruism on the grounds that it inevitably weakens a
 person's own family and strengthens the family of another;
 it would be, at best, imprudent, and in a situation where it
 clearly damaged the interests of the family it would be immoral.

• 156 Strength and prowess, then, matter more than ethical good-
 577 ness. Indeed a man is only good when he is also by implica-
 tion, able and strong. Although aimless violence is dishonour-
 able there is no missing the pleasure it gives when a man is
 forced to kill; nor the prestige which it brings him. For there is
 no more conclusive way of showing that you are stronger than
 by taking away the other man's life.

[562] The form of this system of values is related to three features
 of the social structure: the first of these is the complementary

A SYSTEM OF VALUES

319

opposition of the sexes. It is consistent with the radical character of this opposition that most virtues are sex-linked. Since the sensuality of sex is a critical flaw in human nature, chastity becomes an important element in honour, around which those complementary virtues, the self-assertive qualities of the men, the modest constricted virtues of the women, are organized in defence. At the same time the moral superiority of the male sex in this opposition allows the main burden of the responsibility for original sin to be borne by the woman in a way that does not compromise the inherent nobility of man which is, necessarily, a premise of a system of values based on ideas of honour. And the complementary opposition of the two sexes and their ideal attributes allows the introduction of those quieter feminine virtues of love, modesty, and a disposition to co-operate, without inconsistency in relation to the self-assertive male values, and in the context of inner family life where they are most necessary to express the moral solidarity of the family and support those who face a hostile and competitive world.

The second relevant feature of social structure is the solidarity of the family, and the categorical nature of obligations between its members. This solidarity is both active and passive. Whatever is done or suffered by one member equally affects the honour and shame of the others. No actor stands in isolation without reference to his membership in a family. He carries always a weight of representative responsibility when his actions are observed or even speculated on by others. And, on the other hand, the family is a small group in which there is no security of anonymity when other members fail. In these circumstances, where there is individual responsibility but no certainty of individual justice, important values are variations on the theme of strength and weakness, success and failure. Without self-confidence, prepotence, and skill, a man is 'lost' (*χαμένος*), morally as well as practically.

The relationships of hostility between families unconnected by ties of kinship or marriage are the third feature of social structure. They are oppositions consistent with a particular form of bilateral kinship system, and the absence of any forms of political or economic co-operation other than those based on relationship or patronage. These potentially destructive

577 confrontations are reconciled through the acceptance of
578 competition for prestige as the end of individual and family
purpose. For it turns men's minds from thoughts of the physical
destruction of their enemies to the alternative of their social
humiliation, a form of opposition more compatible with the
vulnerable quality of the shepherd's life. At the same time these
156 particular values, if they deny the practicability of uni-
579 versal moral principles and individual justice, present an
image of man that is in some ways heroic and not ignoble.
Men must be brave and women virtuous to achieve ideal, one
might say mythical, forms of acting and being. They are
encouraged in the need to discipline their weaknesses by the
severity of their mutual criticism; roles are few, and values
unambiguous in a common field of experience. But judge-
ments concern the effectiveness of the total social personality,
an amalgam of virtues, skills, and material attributes; and not
abstract qualities of moral excellence.

571 In competitive institutions, although feelings of hostility
577 may remain unabated, opposition becomes a form of mutual
dependence; the more men are opposed in this way, the more
they have need of one another. The values of prestige recom-
mend the intense consideration of own interests and honour,
accentuating always the exclusiveness and separation of one
family from another. Yet they also impose the condition that
prestige depends on the attentions and opinions of others. They
separate; and, at the same time, they create a necessary and
close interdependence in the common membership of a
community in honour.

GOD AND SIN

327

And in this respect the struggle to control it is so
 fundamental to the belief in their own nobility that, in a community where masculine values are paramount, it has led the Sarakatsani to a form of sexual dualism in which women must bear the main responsibility for this collective sin; a responsibility, however, which is not to be confused with individual guilt.

783
577
562

Envy does not threaten the family in the same way from within, nor does it conflict with the values of honour and pride. Indeed, the emphasis on competitive values, the need to achieve identity with ideal types of social personality, the competitive opposition of family groups, are social values and relationships which inevitably breed envy. Like the fingers on a hand, all men are not the same, Sarakatsani explain. Those who are less fortunate, or less evidently honourable, must envy those others who surpass them. Envy, they admit, leads directly to deceit and cunning. In the form of the evil eye it is a force of psychic hostility and wickedness that pervades the world, spiritually separating man from man, and man from God. Focused through the eyes of an envious man, it may create physical effects of sickness and destruction. These things, it is agreed, are evil, but they arise from the external conditions of a world of limited resources and contrary human wills, not from the conscious sinfulness of individual men. The force of envy is felt to be so pervasive that it would be futile to struggle to control it, as one must struggle to control sensuality; particularly since a man may put the evil eye on another without conscious knowledge or intention. All that an honourable man can do is to avoid in his conscious actions the consequences of excessive envy. For the observer the difference between the ancestral sins of sensuality and envy is that while the former compromises honour, the latter, in a certain sense, is a consequence of it. Naturally, the Sarakatsani do not see the distinction in quite this form.

783
152
156

[257]

[577]

The difference between personal and ancestral sin is not unrelated to the distinction between the Sarakatsani senses of guilt and shame. Both guilt and shame are internal states of conscience but whereas shame is concerned with a man's failure to approach some ideal pattern of conduct, the reference of guilt and personal sin is to the transgression of interdicted limits. Shame relates to failure especially in comparisons with

783
828

SOCIAL VALUES AND RELIGIOUS IDEALS 335

guilt is admitted, Sarakatsani would say that the fault of the man was in the act of turning away from God, not in the sin itself. For without the grace of God he cannot resist the Devil who then leads his victim to the sin he has chosen for him. ¹⁸²₅₇₇²⁷¹₂₈₃⁸²⁸

However, just as children inherit responsibility for the sins of their parents, the responsibility for the sins of Adam cannot be avoided. The condition of sin in which a man lives, although it is exterior to his individual will, interrupts his communion with God on which life and honour depend. It is in this situation that Christ comes to save men, pouring out the sacrifice of his blood to reunite man with God, a salvation, however, which is contingent on man freely turning from the Devil towards God. In a certain sense, then, these forms of sin are a kind of pollution, for which the Devil is originally guilty and responsible, and from which Christ is the saviour. But this analogy must not be pressed too far. This salvation requires moral action on the side of man. In his daily life he must struggle to discipline sensuality and he must avoid the ultimate consequences of envy. For, the fact that all earthly families are imperfect copies of a divine archetype places a limit on the amoral ruthlessness that unrelated men may show towards one another in circumstances where such conduct seriously and unnecessarily endangers the existence of another family. And at certain periods of religious celebration, such as Christmas, Easter, and the feast of Assumption, the sins of Adam must be altogether suppressed through universal continence, goodwill, and the symbolic sharing of food.

Although it is clear that the values of honour are not what they are for any influence of Christian ideals, it would be wrong to suggest, as it has sometimes been said, that Christianity is almost entirely external to Sarakatsan life. Not only are the Sarakatsani deeply conscious of their total dependence on God, whether in the person of The Father or The Saviour, but the family is seen as an image of the Holy Family, and Christian values are the basis of relationships between kinsmen and affines, the people with whom, after all, a man lives and works. And at religious festivals men succeed, momentarily, in living the ideal of a universal brotherhood in Christ. And although, in the periods of profane living which separate these moments of transcendence, men must admire the shrewd and scheming ¹⁸²₅₇₇²⁷¹₂₈₃⁸²⁸

182 leader and accept the need for lies and deceit, the ideal social
 577 personality remains the unmarried pallikari, the 'innocent'
 771 (ἀόωτος), alone with his sheep, not yet fully implicated in the
 156 ancestral sins of sensuality and envy.

182 These beliefs indicate, clearly enough, that the Sarakatsani
 578 sense that all is not right with their world, a sentiment that is
 776 Christian not heroic. When men quarrel and draw their knives,
 771 an event that is the breath of life in an heroic culture, the
 Sarakatsani say, 'The Devil is dancing in the middle' (χορεύει ὁ
 διάβολος μέσα). Indeed the Devil is the symbol and the efficient
 cause of all those many tensions and hostilities which prevent
 the Sarakatsani from living in the values of Christian fellow-
 ship. Not only is he the original cause of the miasma of ancestral
 sin, the provoker of the evil eye and the tempter to sexual lusts,
 but in his desire to injure physically where he cannot corrupt
 morally, his action on the spiritual plane parallels the mutual
 hostilities and social isolation which each family experiences
 in social life.

182 When all this is said there remains an opposition between
 577 Christian ideals and the values of prestige. Fortunately or
 771 otherwise, the Sarakatsani do not see this; partly because the
 829 two value systems either appear to be complementary as in
 family or kindred, or in other areas of social life they are
 relatively segregated in their incidence; and partly because
 the individual thinking in egocentric terms cannot see that his
 own honour, prestige, pride, and self-regard threaten another.
 It is always the other man, and, behind, the Devil moving and
 manipulating him, who corrupt society and provoke the anger
 of God.

/241 cont./

579

Now the idea of "honor" depends upon the moral requirements that Sarakatsani society imposes on its members. These may be grouped under two headings: minor moral requirements and major moral requirements.

Under the heading "minor requirements" we include every case in which a comparative conformity of individuals or groups to rules, norms, moral propositions, etc., is tolerated. In all these instances the persons involved may conform to norms closely or less closely without dishonor.

579

156

If a person /242/ succeeds only more or less in embodying the ideal symbolic image presented to each according to his condition, his status, his role, if a person does not succeed in reaching perfection in commercial, economic, or administrative skill (8) (provided he is not a Tséligas), if

8. Underneath these attributes one finds a "morality of usefulness" according to the terminology of G. Gurvitch, the existence of which is attested by a consideration of the honor those enjoy who achieve it: Ibid., p. 149.

he is not capable of becoming a "rebel leader" or an "animal thief," etc., he is not dishonored, but merely not honored, not distinguished in the crowd. On the other hand, a person is dishonored if he makes no effort to practice "comparative" conformity, if he does not embody this "moral minimum," in other words, if he falls into complete amorality. Sarakatsani society has no room for amorality.

Dishonor also falls on the one who goes outside the fundamental rules of Sarakatsani life. These are the major moral requirements that no one, under any pretext, has the right to transgress. Individuals and groups are inevitably dishonored if they do not conform to the rules pertaining to the creation and functioning of the family, the rules of chastity, of solidarity, of upholding tradition, etc. In all these instances such persons are exposed to general contempt.

However, the one who comes as close as possible to the ideal symbolic image corresponding to the situation and who conforms strictly to the major moral requirements is honored by all.

/242 cont./

577 The Sarakatsani may therefore take his choice between non-distinction, dishonor and honor. These are the limits within which he may deploy his moral activity.

577
156 These alternatives have their justification in the risks that one runs socially by the choice one makes. By choosing non-distinction the subject injures only himself. By opting for infamy (though this may seem paradoxical), that is to say, by violating fundamental rules or denying the "minimum morality," the individual or the group endanger the collectivity which then would react against them with severity. By preferring honor one becomes a pillar of social life, for, thanks to the conduct and example one offers to all, one contributes to its solidity. Honor is the reward to those who have embodied Sarakatsani morality. They become "morality in person."

577
691
681 /243/ As for the line of demarcation separating morality from law, the foregoing remarks show that the major requirements constitute the common threshold. It is in terms of the importance of the infraction committed, therefore the importance of the risks run by non-conformity, that the foregoing passage, analyzed from the standpoint of legal reactions will be understood, and that the mechanism of sanction and coercion is activated.

(626) Thus, the major moral requirements and law may intermingle, the difference residing in the concrete fact of the intensity of social repression: either society is content simply to scorn the culprit or it decides to react more violently.

577
626
691 It follows that morality, as social control, occupies a prominent place among the Sarakatsani, though it cannot be placed above the law. Despite its rigidity, especially with reference to major requirements, it comes after law, though it complements and aids the latter by its own prestige.

577
181
691 The regulation of the actions of these herders, tough, intrepid, independent human beings, true fighters ceaselessly striving to conquer innumerable difficulties and obstacles, requires means more powerful than morals, hence

/411 cont./

121 which ultimately insures the life of all. In Sarakatsani society no one
181 is disinherited. From the time of each person's birth he has a socio-
[554] economic status, determined in advance, a means of subsistence, a
guarantee on his property, assistance in case of misfortune, solidarity
and support of the group in case of danger. Socio-economic differences
exists, to be sure. But no one is left destitute. In case of overwhelming
circumstances, the mechanism of solidarity swings into action so that the
victim will be aided.

121 Of course, individuals are not taken into consideration as such.
181 The Sarakatsani do not preach the cult of individualism. Individuals are
156 perceived in the foresight and functionalism of their society, solely as
cells of the latter and above all as members of the family group. This
formula does not mean that the value "man" has no meaning among the
Sarakatsani, nor that the predominance of the collectivity acts to
obliterate individuals. The Sarakatsani as Greeks and Christians are
sufficiently prepared to have the individual figure in the totality of
their ideas. However, in all cases, and they are numerous, where their
society must make a choice between the individual interest and that of the
group, it will prefer the group.

This choice should not surprise us. It is the consequence of the
way in which the Sarakatsani conceives of himself as a social being, and
conceives of his relations with another, that others, and in short, his
society. And this conception is based on kinship, cooperation, the
community, raised to the rank of supreme values.

* * *

181 /412/ If one has occasion to see Sarakatsani walking in a provincial
city one is struck by their bearing, their pride, their nobility. At
that moment a comparison with peasants of the plains and with townpeople is